

would put the matter right, as I believe the habitat of the plant would give the habitat of the insect.

Might I say in conclusion, if anything further were needed to show the specific distinction between these two insects, that on an occasion before the insect was described, when I was at Tring I read Edward's original description of *neumocengi* out while Dr. Jordan examined a specimen of *burnsi*, and when we had gotten half-way through Dr. Jordan said, "You may stop, that description does not apply to this insect at all." This was *after* Dr. Dyar suggested that I should not describe this insect as their investigator was examining a *Hemileuca* in S. Nevada. Who that investigator was, or what the insect was, I am uncertain. If it was Prof. Aldrich, the larvae which he was investigating and which were used as food by the Indians, some of which were sent to me for identification, were not the larvae of *H. burnsi*, as they fed on willow on the margins of streams. If it was Mr. Ainslie, the insect that he was investigating and of which I have a long series, was *Euleucopheas oliviae*, which feeds on various hard grasses but which I succeeded for a time in getting to feed on some of our common English grasses.

An Interesting new Species of *Eleodes* (Col. : *Tenebrionidae*).

By H. F. WICKHAM, Iowa City, Iowa.

During the late autumn of 1916, I was engaged by the U. S. Bureau of Entomology in making some field investigations of *Eleodes*. Until fairly recently, these insects were not known to inflict much damage upon field and forage crops, but it now looks as if they might have to be reckoned with in various sections of the semiarid interior, since the larvae have developed considerable capacity for depredations upon wheat. In the course of my work, I came across one very small but interesting undescribed species, occurring in abundance in the bean-growing district near Willard, New Mexico, and, though it has not yet been reported as troublesome, it seems desirable that a name be assigned in order that some use may be made

of the field notes and experimental records now in the files of the Bureau. The following description is published by official permission.

In making out the diagnosis, I have tried to follow the general outline laid down by Dr. Blaisdell*, without attempting his extreme refinement of detail. The new species runs easily to his subgenus *Trichelcodes* and is readily separable from either of the two already described by its much smaller size and different vestiture. It is probably very local in habitat, otherwise it seems as if specimens must have come to hand in some of the numerous collections made in the southwestern states during the past fifty years.

***Eleodes barbata* new species.**

Ovate, about twice as long as wide or occasionally a little more elongate, clothed with sparse, curved, golden hairs, intermixed with very much longer straight erect, black ones.

Head feebly convex, frontal suture hardly visible and then only in certain lights; punctuation strong but not coarse nor very dense, with a tendency to form indistinct series radiating from the center of the vertex; hairs similar to those on the prothorax but shorter. Antennae reaching about two-thirds to the prothoracic base, outer three joints moderately incrassate, hardly compressed, third joint scarcely or barely equal to the next two taken together, fourth and fifth subequal, eighth hardly larger than the seventh.

Pronotum widest near the middle, about three-fourths as long as wide, disk moderately convex from side to side, strongly shining, golden hairs of the inner coat numerous but not obscuring the surface, long black hairs sparser, punctures strong and deep, of moderate size, separated by their own diameters or more on the median area, closer and more confused at sides, where they are distinctly muricate. Apex arcuately emarginate, finely beaded on each side of the middle; sides nearly evenly arcuate, a little more rapidly narrowed posteriorly, distinctly margined, the bead fine, attaining the base which is truncate, finely margined at middle, a little more strongly at sides, subequal to the apex; hind angles small but distinct. Propleurae polished, rather strongly, irregularly and more or less rugosely punctured.

Elytra oval, strongly shining, widest along the middle third, base truncate, humeri rounded, sides more arcuate basally and apically, subparallel medially; apex rounded, obtuse, disk convex on the dorsum, more strongly so laterally, posteriorly rather suddenly but not quite vertically declivous; surface very densely, seriatly but not quite reg-

* Bulletin 63, U. S. National Museum, Washington, 1909.

ularly punctate, the punctures moderately deep, muricate or subasperate, especially towards the sides and tip. Vestiture double, similar to that of the pronotum.

Epipleurae finely, rugosely punctured. Meso- and metathoracic sidepieces shining, punctures moderate in size, deep, more or less crowded or confluent. Abdomen sparsely hairy, moderately punctured, the last segment much more finely and sparsely.

Legs of moderate length and stoutness, relatively shorter than in *E. hirsuta*, closely and fairly coarsely punctured, with double vestiture, the long hairs more numerous upon the tibiae than on the femora. Thighs simple, fore and middle tibiae about straight, hind tibiae very plainly recurved or bent upwards at tip.

The first abdominal segment is distinctly shorter than the second and third united. The prosternum has a strong mucro upon its posterior face. The spurs of the fore tibiae are rather slender, slightly curved and subequal to each other in both sexes, but are longer in the female: those of the middle and hind tibiae are straight, the inner much longer than the outer. The male has a flatter abdomen than the female and is less robust.

Length, 6 to 7.25 mm. Breadth, ♂, 3 mm., ♀, 3.50 mm.

In general appearance, this species recalls *E. hirsuta* Horn, but differs in size, outline, and many other characters. Some of the most readily seen differentials in *E. barbata* are the relatively longer elytra with more pronounced humeri and more broadly rounded apex, the double vestiture with decidedly more conspicuous long hairs, relatively shorter legs and antennae, sparser prothoracic punctuation and shorter first ventral. It looks decidedly like an *Amphidora*, but a study of the generic characters inclines me to place it in *Eleodes*. Little difference exists in the tarsal vestiture of the Blaptini and the Amphidorini, as defined by LeConte and Horn* but the present insect goes better with *Eleodes* by the form of the elytral epipleurae and the size of the tibial spurs.

Numerous specimens were taken under dried dung among short brush in the fine sandy soil about Willard, New Mexico, in September.

Types have been returned to the U. S. Bureau of Entomology.

* Classification of the Coleoptera of North America. Washington, 1883, pp. 373 and 375.